

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this application. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-49 are now pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 12, 21, 28, 30, 36, and 41 are independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 26, and 28 have been amended. New Claims 29-49 have been added.

Claims 2 and 28 have been amended to address minor typographical errors. Claim 26 has been amended to clarify the claim. Claims 1 and 28 have been amended to provide a preferred claim wording (“including” changed to “to store”).

New Claim 29 adds an antenna coupled to the wireless communication circuitry of Claim 1. This added limitation is supported by the specification, e.g., in Figs. 4A and 4B.

New Claims 30-40 correspond to selected ones of Claims 12-27 but present the subject matter in the form of a processor-readable medium. This is supported in the specification, e.g., at paragraphs [1094]-[1096] and Fig. 4A. Otherwise, all of the limitations of these new claims may be found in the claims as originally filed.

New Claims 41-49 are similar to selected subject matter of Claims 1-11 but claim a device using means-plus-function language. Therefore, these are supported at least by the claims as originally filed.

At pages 2-4, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-4, 12, 21, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mandelbaum (U.S. Patent No. 5,541,583). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 28 (as amended) both include “a memory to store a plurality of entries identifying a set of wireless network devices, each entry of the plurality of entries associated with a wireless network device of the set of wireless network devices and including a unique device identification number.” The Office Action, at page 2, asserts that this is taught at col. 3, lines 10-35 of Mandelbaum and, in particular, that these lines “teach the interrogator No. 10 as smart card wherein contain memory including a plurality of entries identifying such as SITE 11 through SITE 11_N [*sic*].” It appears that this portion of Mandelbaum may have been misinterpreted by the Office Action.

In particular, col. 3, lines 10-35 of Mandelbaum are discussing an interrogator system for smart cards. As discussed at lines 23-26, an interrogator 10 includes a number of geographically dispersed sites (11₁-11_N) with their respective antennas 12 and a controller 16 and a host 17. This portion of Mandelbaum goes on to further state, “Also illustrative [*sic*] shown in FIG. 1, but is not a [part] of the interrogator 10 are smart cards 20.” Mandelbaum at col. 3, lines 27-28. That is, *the smart cards are not part of the interrogator system* (in Mandelbaum, line 27 contains an obvious typographical error, where “part” appears to have been mis-typeset as “pan”). This is further evidenced at col. 4, lines 14-19, where it is discussed that the interrogator system *obtains* a unique identification number associated with each card (when it communicates with each card, as discussed in the preceding lines). Therefore, Applicants find no disclosure in Mandelbaum of a memory to store such identification numbers within the interrogator system, as asserted by the Office Action.

Similarly, Claim 12 recites “selecting an entry from a plurality of entries identifying a plurality of authorized wireless communication devices, the entry associated

with a wireless communication device and including an identification number associated with the wireless communication device.” It is initially noted that the Office Action fails to point out where Mandelbaum discloses this. It is further noted that, as discussed above, the interrogator in Mandelbaum obtains identification information from a smart card when it interrogates the smart card; Applicants have found no disclosure of “selecting an entry,” as claimed.

Claim 28 recites, among other things, “determining whether the second identification number is included in a list of wireless device identification numbers identifying a set of authorized direct connection wireless communication devices.” The Office Action fails to point out where in Mandelbaum there is any corresponding disclosure. Additionally, Applicants have reviewed Mandelbaum and are unable to locate any such disclosure. For example, Applicants have not found any disclosure of a list of wireless identification numbers identifying a set of authorized direct connection wireless communication devices, as claimed.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4, 12, 21, and 28 are allowable over Mandelbaum.

At pages 4-8, the Office Action rejects Claims 5-11, 13-20, and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandelbaum in view of Emery et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,975). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are all directed to claims that depend from Claims 1, 12, and 21. Furthermore, the Office Action relies on the same discussion of Mandelbaum as was relied upon in connection with the rejections

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) above. Therefore, the above discussion applies to these claims, as well. Furthermore, Applicants have reviewed Emery et al. and are unable to locate any disclosure that would remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Mandelbaum.

Additionally, Applicants do not believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify an interrogator system for smart cards (as in Mandelbaum) to include such features as voice communication and/or many of the other features found in the dependent claims. Such features are totally irrelevant to a smart card interrogation system.

For at least the above reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-28 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants further note that, given the above discussion of the relationships between new Claims 29-49 and the previously-existing claims, new Claims 29-49 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the above amendments and remarks address all of the grounds for objection and rejection and place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply and reconsideration of this application.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey W. Gluck/

Date: March 16, 2007

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1990 M Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
Telephone: 202-331-7111
Direct Dial: 202-572-0322
Facsimile: 202-293-6229

JWG/bms
CB-523952